

Message

From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]
Sent: 4/10/2018 11:09:12 PM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Hunters Point questions

FYI

From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 4:07 PM
To: Edmondson, Russ@DTSC <Russ.Edmondson@dtsc.ca.gov>
Cc: Naito, Janet@DTSC <Janet.Naito@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Hunters Point questions

Hi Ed,
See my responses below in blue.

Nina

From: Edmondson, Russ@DTSC
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 10:41 AM
To: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>; Naito, Janet@DTSC <Janet.Naito@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Hunters Point questions

Hi Nina, we received this media inquiry from Inside EPA and she has a deadline of Friday. Please let me know how best to respond.

Thanks!
Russ

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Suzanne Yohannan <suzanne.yohannan@iwpnews.com>
Date: April 10, 2018 at 10:10:58 AM PDT
To: "Edmondson, Russ@DTSC" <Russ.Edmondson@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: Hunters Point questions

Russ,

I have some questions about a recent spate of documents released via FOIA from EPA about the Hunters Point cleanup. One of EPA's documents cites DTSC as part of a review EPA took into the falsification or data quality issues related to the reliability of soil sampling at two parcels at Hunters Point. A Dec. 27 letter from EPA Region 9 to the Navy on this says: "EPA, DTSC, and CDPH found signs of potential falsification, data manipulation, and/or data quality concerns that call into question the reliability of soil data in an additional 76% of survey units, bringing to 90% the total suspect soil survey units in Parcel B" at Hunters Point. "In Parcel G, the Navy recommended resampling 49% of survey units, and regulatory agencies recommended 49% more, for a total of 97% of survey units as suspect."

These related to soil sampling that contractor Tetra Tech had done at the site.

Given DTSC's participation in the review, I was wondering whether the state plans to follow up -
- any plans to require Navy to re-take these samples to see if additional cleanup is needed before land transfer?

The purpose of the radiological data evaluation was to determine if resampling and further cleanup is necessary. DTSC, in collaboration with CDPH and the US EPA, conducted a detailed review of the Parcel G report. The regulatory agencies review included additional potential concerns such as data quality. DTSC determined that the Navy's findings are significant and require resampling of the entire Parcel G which the Navy has agreed to do. The amount of resampling to be conducted is still being determined.

Also, in addition to what EPA released (noted above and as part of a FOIA response to the group PEER), does DTSC have other analyses it has done regarding these or other parcels of land it is re-looking at given the revelations about Tetra Tech's actions at Hunters Point?

DTSC is also reviewing Navy Radiological Data Evaluation Findings Reports for soil in other parcels where Tetra Tech EC conducted radiological work (Parcels B, C, UC-1, UC-2, D-2, and E), and also one report that covers all buildings within those parcels.

Third, does DTSC plan its own broader investigation into Tetra Tech's work at other contaminated sites to determine if there was falsifications or data manipulation elsewhere within the state? Or does DTSC plan to refer this to the state attorney general's office for further investigation? If so, can you provide details as to when and what it is referring?

DTSC is not aware of any allegations of possible falsification of data by Tetra Tech EC at any other project sites.

I'm working under a deadline of Friday, April 13.

I can be reached at the email or number below.

Thanks very much.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Yohannan
Inside EPA
703-562-8759
suzanne@iwpnews.com